

their co-workers was fortunately spared.

Here is how the Washington Post described this brutal crime:

Because Kenneth Joel Marshall was a trusted co-worker, the four men and women working the closing shift at the McDonald's on the eastern edge of Capitol Hill opened the door for him when he showed up shortly before 2 a.m. * * * Minutes later, police said, Marshall pulled a gun, forced the manager to open a safe, herded his co-workers into a basement freezer and pumped bullets into the heads of three of them, a woman and two men. Bent on leaving no witnesses, police said, he turned to the fourth worker, a woman. Twice, he allegedly aimed his gun at her head and squeezed the trigger. Twice, the gun clicked but did not fire.

Apparently, the person who committed this unspeakably evil act fled the crime scene. He was subsequently arrested by the D.C. police department. According to newspaper accounts, the killer also had a prior criminal record, having been arrested by the D.C. police at least seven times since 1987 on both drug and weapons charges.

Mr. President, it is, of course, impossible to make any sense out of such senselessness.

I simply want to take this opportunity to express my own outrage at what has befallen three of our citizens—citizens of the Nation's Capital—and I know I speak for all my colleagues in the Senate when I extend our prayers and heartfelt sympathies to the families of the victims.

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, all too often in our political discourse, we concentrate on the differences separating the two parties, rather than emphasizing those areas on which there is agreement or at least the potential for agreement.

Last week, the Democratic leadership council—through its think tank, the progressive policy institute—issued an important paper outlining its views on affirmative action. Although I do not agree with every point made in this paper, it does suggest that there is ample room for Republicans and open-minded Democrats to forge a new consensus on the meaning of equal opportunity.

I have three observations about the DLC paper that I would like to share now with my Senate colleagues.

One. The paper calls for the "phase-out" of mandatory preferences in contract set-asides, public jobs, and hiring by private firms that do business with the Government on the grounds that these preferences "put Government in the business of institutionalizing racial distinctions." The DLC says that these distinctions are "hardly a good idea for a democracy held together by common civic deals that transcend group identity."

This position is very similar, if not identical, to the principle underlying the Equal Opportunity Act of 1995, which I introduced late last month with Congressman CHARLES CANADY of Florida and more than 80 other Congressional Republicans. The Equal Op-

portunity Act would prohibit the Federal Government from granting preferences to anyone on the basis of race or gender in three key areas: Federal employment, Federal contracting, and federally conducted programs.

The DLC apparently supports this proposition, but wants a gradual phase-in of any ban on group preferences, not their immediate elimination.

In other words, our difference is one of timing, not one of principle.

It is my hope, however, that the DLC will come to understand that if discrimination is wrong, it is wrong today as well as tomorrow, and ought to be ended immediately.

In fact, the DLC goes much further than the Equal Opportunity Act by calling for the outright repeal of "Lyndon Johnson's 1965 Executive order requiring Federal contractors to adopt minority hiring goals and timetables." In its paper, the DLC argues that these guidelines "encourage employers to hire women and minorities on a rigidly proportional basis," a statement that is directly at odds with President Clinton's own affirmative action review.

In my view, it is appropriate for the Federal Government to require Federal contractors not to discriminate in employment. That was the original purpose of Executive Order 11246. Unfortunately, bureaucratic implementation of the Executive order has converted it from a program aimed at eliminating discrimination to one that relies on it in the form of preferences.

Our first priority should be to restore the original meaning and purpose of the Executive order, not to repeal it, as the DLC has suggested.

Second, the DLC argues that we need to replace Government preferences for groups with new public policies that empower individuals to get ahead regardless of race, gender, or ethnicity. The DLC argues that an empowerment agenda is critical to "striking a new bargain on racial equality and opportunity."

I happen to agree that we need to forge a new civil rights agenda for the 1990's, one rooted in policies that are relevant to the needs and challenges of our time. I do so, however, not as part of a bargain, as if one should be defensive about opposing discrimination in the form of preferences.

I support a new civil rights agenda simply because making Government policy by race is not only wrong, but a diversion from reality, an easy excuse to ignore the very serious problems that affect all Americans, whatever their race, or heritage, or gender may be.

Nearly 30 percent of our children are born out of wedlock. Only one-third of our high school graduates are proficient readers. And children routinely kill other children.

These are the realities of our time, and this is where our focus should be.

That is why Congressman J.C. WATTS and I recently took the step of offering a blueprint for a new civil rights agen-

da. This agenda includes: strengthening the family by reforming a corrupt welfare system that has substituted Government dependence for personal independence; investing crime-fighting resources in our inner-city communities and ensuring that those who commit violent crimes stay behind bars where they belong; giving low-income parents the opportunity to choose the school, public or private, that they consider most desirable for their children; removing regulatory barriers to opportunity; and, of course, enforcing the anti-discrimination laws that are already on the books.

Finally, the DLC has joined me and other Republicans in taking issue with the Clinton administration's position in the Piscataway case. In this case, the Justice Department has turned the principle of equal opportunity on its head by arguing that a school district may legally fire a teacher, solely because of her race, in order to maintain workforce diversity. The DLC is correct to point out that the Justice Department's position, taken to its logical extreme, would "sever the increasingly tenuous link between race-conscious remedies and specific acts of discrimination and wipe out the distinction between preferences and quotas."

Mr. President, I welcome the DLC's contribution to this debate. We may not agree on every point and on every issue, but we both agree that the group-preference status quo is no longer tenable.

Race should not be a wedge issue. If we keep our voices low and our intentions good, I am convinced that this long-overdue debate can, in fact, serve as a catalyst to unite the American people, not divide us.

1995 FARM BILL

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, when Congress reconvenes in September, the race to write the 1995 farm bill will hit full stride. This year marks the ninth farm bill that I have been involved in.

Historically, agriculture stands at a crossroads every 5 years when Congress decides what direction it should go. This year, I believe there is agreement in this Chamber about which path to take. However, I would be remiss if I did not mention that there is significant disagreement about how best to get there.

When Senators return home over the next few weeks, they will hear from their rural constituents the need for an aggressive farm policy. No doubt, the American people will provide their Senators with practical suggestions regarding the farm policy choices now before Congress.

When we return in September, we will face several choices on farm policy. Three that come to mind are stay the course, reduction in support, and freedom to farm. Each choice has advantages; each choice has disadvantages.

The stay-the-course plan is piloted by my good friend from Mississippi Senator COCHRAN, who approaches the farm bill with the conviction that our work in 1985 was sound and that we should continue with this course while making changes necessary to balance the budget.

The reduction-in-support strategy was outlined by Chairman LUGAR early in the debate, and combines a reduction in target prices with the call for planting flexibility and elimination of set-asides—two points that are a priority in Kansas and much of the Midwest.

The freedom-to-farm concept is endorsed by my good friend and colleague Representative PAT ROBERTS. In typical Kansas fashion, he has taken the bull by the horns. In the Roberts freedom-to-farm plan, budget balancing is done with a cap on farm spending which guarantees farmers less income support but is coupled with full planting flexibility and regulatory relief.

I urge all Senators to take advantage of the August recess and reconnect with the concerns of rural Americans. Like many of my colleagues, I am still evaluating each of these approaches as well as other policy options. But I realize that we must reach agreement in September. In my view, there are certain guiding principles we must adhere to as we pursue that goal.

First, fiscal responsibility. We must achieve a balanced budget and do it in a manner that is fair and equitable to farmers. We have worked hard to balance the budget. The line-item veto was a first step toward that goal. A balanced budget amendment failed by just one vote. We hope we can pick up that vote in the next several months. In September, we will begin work on a plan to balance the Federal budget over the next 7 years. Farmers around the country remind me that they are taxpayers too. And as taxpayers, farmers want a balanced budget. All they ask is that spending cuts are fair and equitable. Everyone will take his or her fair share, whether it be food stamps or farm programs. And let me add that there will be equity in commodity program spending reductions and policy changes. The AG community will face its fair share of spending reductions as we move to fully implement a balanced budget.

Second, unleash our productive capacity. We must allow farmers to decide what and how much to plant each year. Planting restrictions and idling acreage based on budget mandates instead of supply management must end. Through the new markets and new opportunities opened by GATT and NAFTA, we must be able to meet demand. The farm policy that drives the U.S. into the 21st century should not be based on the supply management concepts of the 1930's. A farmer's business decisions should not be based on Government policy, but instead on market signals, agronomic practices and personal choice.

Third, simplicity. Farm programs and environmental regulations should be simpler and more sensible. They should reflect a basic respect for private property rights and the work ethic of the family farmer. For several years now, as I traveled through Kansas and throughout the country, farmers have been telling me the same thing—keep it simple. All farm programs—and especially all regulations—must be simpler and less intrusive. Our efforts to provide regulatory relief for rural America have been blocked by those on the other side of the aisle. I hope that when my colleagues return to their States in August, they will listen to their constituents' pleas to rein in the Federal Government.

American agriculture does not operate in a vacuum. Rural Americans share the Republican conviction that Congress must balance the budget, and that we must provide tax relief, regulatory relief and health care reform. Rural Americans realize that there are important policies outside the farm bill that greatly affect their bottom lines. Mr. President, we are actively working to provide the needed relief that rural America is asking for. And we will not stop. The reconciliation debate in September will focus national attention on issues vital to rural America. This is our opportunity to make real progress.

When it comes to policy for rural America, I can not help but be reminded of the peanuts cartoon, where Lucy pulls the football away from Charlie Brown at the last minute.

Unfortunately, just like Charlie Brown, the American farmer keeps running at the ball and Congress keeps pulling it away. A workable policy for rural America is not achieved by taunting the American farmer. It is achieved by everyone—agriculture, Congress and USDA—playing together on the same team.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no further morning business, morning business is closed.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. DOLE. I call for regular order with respect to the welfare bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare

spending, and reduce welfare dependence, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2280, AS FURTHER MODIFIED

Mr. DOLE. I have a modification at the desk. I have a right to modify my amendment, and I ask that it be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

So the amendment (No. 2280), as modified, is as follows:

On page 1, line 3, of the bill, after "SECTION 1.", strike all through the end and insert the following:

SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Work Opportunity Act of 1995".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

- Sec. 100. References to Social Security Act.
- Sec. 101. Block grants to States.
- Sec. 102. Services provided by charitable, religious, or private organizations.
- Sec. 103. Limitations on use of funds for certain purposes.
- Sec. 104. Continued application of current standards under medicaid program.
- Sec. 105. Census data on grandparents as primary caregivers for their grandchildren.
- Sec. 106. Conforming amendments to the Social Security Act.
- Sec. 107. Conforming amendments to the Food Stamp Act of 1977 and related provisions.
- Sec. 108. Conforming amendments to other laws.
- Sec. 109. Study of effect of welfare reform on grandparents as primary caregivers.
- Sec. 110. Disclosure of receipt of Federal funds.
- Sec. 111. Secretarial submission of legislative proposal for technical and conforming amendments.
- Sec. 112. Effective date; transition rule.

TITLE II—SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

Subtitle A—Eligibility Restrictions

- Sec. 201. Denial of supplemental security income benefits by reason of disability to drug addicts and alcoholics.
- Sec. 202. Limited eligibility of noncitizens for SSI benefits.
- Sec. 203. Denial of SSI benefits for 10 years to individuals found to have fraudulently misrepresented residence in order to obtain benefits simultaneously in 2 or more States.
- Sec. 204. Denial of SSI benefits for fugitive felons and probation and parole violators.
- Sec. 205. Effective dates; application to current recipients.

Subtitle B—Benefits for Disabled Children

- Sec. 211. Definition and eligibility rules.
- Sec. 212. Eligibility redeterminations and continuing disability reviews.
- Sec. 213. Additional accountability requirements.

Subtitle C—Studies Regarding Supplemental Security Income Program

- Sec. 221. Annual report on the supplemental security income program.